

## THE FRENCH REPUBLIC.

## A DEFINITE TREATY OF PEACE TO BE NEGOTIATED AT BRUSSELS.

JULES FAYRE THE FRENCH REPRESENTATIVE—HERR VON ARMIN TO REPRESENT PRUSSIA.

LONDON, Monday, March 6, 1871.

The negotiations for a definitive treaty of peace will begin shortly at Brussels. It is said that M. Favre will be the French plenipotentiary. It is probable that Herr Von Armin, acting on the part of France, have already settled the main points, but the details, it is thought, will occupy several months.

## MOVEMENT OF TROOPS.

THE PRUSSIAN WITHDRAWING WITHIN THEIR PRESCRIBED LIMITS—THE PARIS GARRISON RE-ENFORCED—FRENCH PRISONERS RELEASED.

LONDON, Monday, March 6, 1871.

The Germans are rapidly evacuating the prescribed limits of France, the movement being conducted quietly and with admirable order. The Emperor goes this week to Ferrières, and will review the various corps during his journey. Mont Valerien and all the other forts will be evacuated on the 10th, Rouen on the 12th, and the left bank of the Seine on the 19th inst.

A corps of 40,000 French soldiers from the provinces is now marching into Paris, where it will replace the troops of the line and Garde Mobiles, who will begin to leave the capital on Monday. The staffs of the French and German armies are making arrangements to prevent the Germans from encountering the French in their movements.

A Dresden journal says all the French officers and all privates of the Garde Mobiles, prisoners in Germany, may return immediately to their homes, if they so desire, at their own cost. Soldiers of the line and Imperial Guard will remain interned until arrangements for their transportation are completed.

The French soldiers interned in Belgium are to be reconducted to the frontier of France on the 9th and 10th inst.

At the review of the Prussian guards at Long Champs, the Emperor William addressed the troops. He thanked them for their heroism, endurance, and devotion they had displayed, and added that they must thank Providence for choosing them as the instruments to bring to pass events of such magnitude and renown.

## MISCELLANEOUS NEWS.

THE DEPOSED EMPEROR GOING TO ENGLAND—THE STATE OF PARIS—REMOVAL OF THE ASSEMBLY FROM BORDEAUX.

LONDON, Monday, March 6, 1871.

The Emperor Napoleon is hourly expected at Chislehurst, the abode of the Empress Eugenie.

The Journal *Officiel* acknowledges that several battalions of the National Guard have retained their guns, but only to prevent their falling into the hands of the Prussians. The anomalous situation will speedily terminate. Passes to leave and enter Paris are no longer required.

It is reported that M. Favre has gone to Versailles with an architect to prepare the palace for the reception of the National Assembly, in anticipation of their early removal from Bordeaux.

It is reported in Paris that Jules Favre and Simon have tendered their resignations, but that Thiers will not accept them.

## GENERAL FOREIGN NEWS.

## ENGLAND.

PROCEEDINGS IN PARLIAMENT—ENGLAND LOSING HER PRESTIGE AS A FIRST-CLASS POWER—SERIOUS TROUBLES IN IRELAND.

LONDON, Monday, March 6, 1871.

In the House of Lords, this evening, the Marquis of Salisbury attacked the foreign policy of the Government, claiming that foreign Powers were all-compassionate in their manner toward England. He had declined the aid of England in negotiating peace with France, and Russia had repudiated obligations solemnly agreed to at the end of the Crimean war. These results he placed in contrast with the guarantees which England was a party to, and from them deduced the decay of her international influence. He urged the reorganization of the army, to the weakness of which he attributed much of England's loss of prestige.

Earl Granville protested against the unreasonableness of the assault made upon the conduct of foreign affairs by the Government. He quoted a distinguished American officer, who had expressed his surprise at the complete state of preparation for war in which he found the British navy.

The discussion ended by the adoption of an order for reprinting the text of the guarantees given by England in continental matters.

In the House of Commons, to-day, Mr. Disraeli gave notice that he should at a future day ask the Government to inform the House whether or not it was aware of last year's treaty between Russia and Prussia, when Mr. Odo Russell was sent to Versailles to consult the German Chancellor.

Mr. Gladstone communicated to the House information received from Westmeath County, Ireland, confirming previous reports of the mischievous tendency of affairs there. He said that special measures of precaution were needed, for the lives of the judges in that county were threatened, and he urged the members to take speedy action.

The bill for army reorganization was taken up, and there was a sharp debate over the clause abolishing the purchase of commissions, the supporters of the system predicting a loss of military character and prestige should it be abolished.

## TAMMANY'S GRAND SACHEM—TWEED'S CHANCES.

The Tammany Society met last evening in Tammany Hall, James B. Nicholson, Father of the Council, in the chair. It was resolved to hold the next annual election for Sachems on the third Monday in April. Much interest attaches to this prospective election, as it is reported that several changes will be made, and it is a subject of conjecture as to what the newly-elected Sachem will do in relation to keeping Grand Sachem Tweed in office. According to the rules of Tammany Society, the same person cannot be elected Grand Sachem two terms in succession. Notwithstanding this rule, Senator Tweed has been Grand Sachem two successive terms, being kept in office the second term by the Sachems failing to hold an election, which enabled him to hold over and evade the rule, but had previously operated without an exception. Whether he will again "hold over," or will this time be elected, on the ground that he was not elected the last time, or whether, therefore, he be elected two successive terms, is a question which the new Sachems will find a way to solve.

## FIRES IN BROADWAY AND TRAIL ST.

A fire occurred last evening on the upper floor of Nos. 1,200 and 1,201 Broadway, occupied as a grocery store, by James Jenkins, and extended to the houses adjoining. All were seriously damaged. The loss of Jenkins was \$5,000; partially insured, No. 1,200 was occupied on the first floor by James Murray as a book and shoe store. Loss on stock, \$800; not insured. The upper part was occupied by four families, whose clothing and furniture were lost. No. 1,201 is occupied on the first floor by J. Van O'Brien as a grocery; loss on stock, \$100; not insured. The upper part is occupied by a family; loss on stock, \$100; not insured. The buildings are the property of James Jenkins, who is a native of Ireland.

## WASHINGTON.

LEGISLATION CONCERNING THE PROBABLE LENGTH OF THE SESSION OF CONGRESS—THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE—STRUGGLE FOR THE CHAIRMANSHIP—LAWLESSNESS IN SOUTH CAROLINA—U. S. TROOPS CALLED FOR BY THE GOVERNOR.

BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.

WASHINGTON, Monday, March 6, 1871.

The Senate Republican caucus will meet to-morrow morning for the purpose of appointing a committee to review the list of Senate Committees, and of considering the question of fixing an early date for adjournment. Much difference of opinion prevails among Senators upon the latter question. It is certain that the House resolution will not be agreed to, and the prospect now is that there will be a total disagreement on the part of the Senate, as many Senators are strongly opposed to adjourning before something is done to put a stop to the acts of lawlessness and violence in the South, which they say are increasing to an alarming extent. They declare it would be disgraceful for Congress to go home, in face of the state of affairs existing in North and South Carolina. Others want the duty on coal and salt repealed, and the income tax abolished, before adjourning, and still others want to stay long enough to annex Santo Domingo. It is quite certain that if any general legislation is begun, it will be impossible to bring the session to a close under a month or six weeks. If, therefore, both Houses do not agree by the end of this week upon a day for adjourning, it will be safe to predict that Congress will sit until the middle of April.

The organization of the Ways and Means Committee is the topic of the most absorbing interest here at present. Two months ago, the most prominent candidates for the Chairmanship of the Committee were believed to be Mr. Dawes, Judge Kelley, and Gen. Garfield. Some weeks ago, Mr. Dawes signified his special desire to remain at the head of the Appropriations Committee, and so strong an opposition was developed in some quarters to Judge Kelley, on account of his devotion to the principle of Protection, that he was believed to be out of the question. It was then conceded that Gen. Garfield would be given the place, as a moderate Protectionist of long service on the Finance Committee, and with force and ability enough to lead the House; and people settled down into this belief until about a week ago, when vague rumors began to prevail that something new was in progress. It now appears that High Tariff men have united in a great effort to keep Gen. Garfield out of the Committee. They accuse him of being unsafe upon the question of Protection, and of leaning toward the views of the "Revenue Reformers." A weighty influence has thus been brought to bear upon the speaker, and Gen. Garfield's Chairmanship, Success is claimed, to-day, and that a new programme has been agreed on by which Mr. Dawes will consent to take the Ways and Means Chairmanship, to which it is urged that he is entitled as the regular promotion from his present position. In such a case Gen. Garfield would succeed Mr. Dawes in the Appropriations Chairmanship, and Mr. Hooper would get the Banking and Currency Committee. Properly to make up the Ways and Means Committee is the most perplexing and difficult task devolving upon the speaker, and it is difficult to see how it can be done at present on account of the unsettled state of opinion upon questions of Tariff and Taxation, and the lack of positive knowledge of the views of a majority of the House upon these subjects. If the Committee does not fairly represent the House, it will lose all dignity, importance, and character of leadership. Mr. Blaine is, therefore, desirous of postponing the appointment of the Committee until the December session, by which time he will have learned more of the views of the new members.

Gov. Scott has called upon the President for United States troops to suppress outrages in the Counties of Union and York in South Carolina, where he reports that men are murdered or driven from their homes without notice, because of their political opinion. Gov. Scott informs the President that there is no sufficiently armed and equipped militia to give the needed protection, and that if he did have at his disposal a competent militia force, there are no funds in the State Treasury to transport them. He says that he has no troops, with the military resources of the State, to successfully meet in the field the trained soldiers who held the United States at bay for four years, and often achieved signal triumphs over his best armies; and that to expect this to be to initiate the Egyptian system, with a most grievous improvement, requiring the making of bricks with neither straw nor clay. He states that the Ku-Klux, that were formerly thought to be a mere political ghost, a bloody specter, conjured up for party purposes, is now a terrible fact, an armed organization, thoroughly equipped in its field, staff, and line officers, and engaged in the most systematic and organized work of terror and bloodshed. He says that if Congress will pass an act authorizing the State a full reimbursement for money expended in suppressing domestic violence, South Carolina can then obtain the necessary credit to mobilize her militia, and sustain them in the field. Nothing but a permanent garrison in the disaffected sections will give the protection to the men who are threatened with murder or exile, solely because of their fidelity to the principles of free government. As an evidence of the condition of affairs in South Carolina, the facts are stated, that, on last Friday, a company of United States troops, that left Columbia for York, had the railroad torn up, and a body of armed men, who were obliged to march by the back road. On Friday last the Republican members of the Legislature, now sitting, paid men to march to the road leading from the Capital, because of well-grounded fears of a Ku-Klux raid upon their body. A Committee of three members of the Legislature of South Carolina will arrive here in a day or two to lay the condition of affairs in South Carolina before the President. Mr. Warren Wilkes, the leading Conservative member of the South Carolina Legislature, is one of the Committee.

Commissioner Pleasanton will send to Congress, at an early day, a communication in regard to the income tax, the export of whisky, and a modification of the Tobacco laws. He will repeat the recommendation that the House and Senate be authorized to take action on the matter through the Departments, which they had been obliged to neglect during the past week.

The only new land grant measures which passed the XLII Congress were the following: Oregon Pacific, Pacific Railroad, 4,700,000 acres; supplemental Northern Pacific, 11,000,000; Texas Pacific, with New Orleans, La., and Fort Yuma, Cal., branches, 18,000,000; making a total of 23,700,000 acres. At the opening of last session there were on the Speaker's table 23 land grant Senate bills, of which 19 were for grants to railroads, one for an irrigation canal in New Mexico, another for the Florida, and one for the Colorado. The Department of the Interior, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, has been authorized to issue orders for the sale of the lands of the United States, and to the State of Florida, for the purpose of raising the total amount involved in these bills was estimated by the General Land Office at 75,000,000 acres. In this batch of acts the Texas Pacific, originally passed by the Senate, called for 20,000,000 acres. The bill substituted by the House called for about 12,000,000 acres; that which passed, it is estimated, added about 3,000,000 more, making the total as above. Beside the 23 bills on the Speaker's table, the Senate had on its calendar 32 bills, 25 of which were for railroads, eight for canals, and one for a small steamship company. The total amount required by these bills was estimated at \$14,000,000. The total amount asked by the Senate measures was \$18,254,229 acres. In the House every such bill introduced being referred, under the rules, to the Public Lands Committee, was smothered there, so the House is not responsible for any of these propositions.

It is probable that the Hon. Amos Cobb of Wisconsin will be appointed one of the three Commissioners to examine claims for Quartermasters' and Commissaries' stores, taken by the army from loyal people at the South, since Mr. Cobb has just completed a term of eight years in the House, and his long service upon the Committee of Claims has peculiarly fitted him for the difficult work of the new Claims Commission.

Ex-Senator Abbott of North Carolina will present to the Senate, to-morrow, through Senator Pool, a carefully drawn memorial setting forth the grounds for the claim made in his behalf, that he is legally elected U. S. Senator from North Carolina, for the term beginning on the 4th inst. The memorial presents a succinct history of the election held by the Legislature on the second Tuesday of November, 1868. According to this statement the vote stood as follows: In the Senate, for Zebulon Vance, 27; for Joseph C. Abbott, 11; scattering, 8; making 45 persons voting. In the House of Representatives, on the same day, Mr. Vance received 60, Mr. Abbott, 22, and 30 votes cast for six other persons; in all 142 persons voting.

The Legislature next day went into Joint Convention, and Zebulon B. Vance was declared elected to the United States Senate, instead of the declaration being made, as of right it ought to have been, according to Mr. Abbott's memorial, that the memorialist had received a majority of the votes legally cast. Mr. Vance memorializes that if the votes cast for him had been of validity or effect, he would have been duly elected; but because of reasons set forth, Mr. Abbott claims that these votes were void, and of no effect, and ought not to have been received, counted, or declared as votes. Their only legal effect is the evidence they furnish of the presence of a quorum at said election. Mr. Vance was a member of the House of Representatives of the United States previous to the War of the Rebellion, and as such he took the oath to support the Constitution. During the Rebellion he accepted and held the office of Colonel in the Rebel army, and took an oath of allegiance to the Confederacy. He was also Rebel Governor of North Carolina from August, 1862, to April, 1865, when the forces occupied North Carolina. These are matters of common history, well known to the Senators and Representatives whose votes were given to him.

The facts can be proven by the testimony of the members who voted for him, by the fact that, in the caucus held by such members, Mr. Vance's disqualification was fully discussed, and by a unanimous vote it was resolved to disregard the fact that under the Constitution and laws of the United States he was ineligible for an official position. Mr. Abbott's memorial takes the ground that such ineligibility invalidates the election, that Mr. Vance was not entitled to be voted for, and that such has been the determination of the Senate in all contested elections, where such disqualifications have existed. Mr. Abbott proceeds:

"Your memorialist freely admits that, in a case where the Legislature should vote for a person under disqualification, without knowledge of the facts, while the votes would be void in so far as to give no title to the place to the individual who received them, yet the Legislature is in consequence with justice, to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the required age, but your memorialist admits that the Legislature, in such a case, is not bound to remit the case to the body laboring under misapprehension for a new election, for example, under the laws of a State of 22 years of age, under the belief that he had attained the